



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/455,964	12/06/1999	RICHARD QIAN	KLR:7146.048	5789

7590 04/28/2003

CHARNOFF VILHAUER MCCLUNG & STENZEL LLP
1600 ODS TOWER
601 S W SECOND AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

B

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/455,964

Applicant(s)

QIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Son P Huynh

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 1966.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2-7. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1- 4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dodson et al. EP 0,848,554).

Regarding claim 1, Dodson teaches a method comprising:

identifying a domain of video (the domain is movie, user request for displaying overlay

200- see figure 2 and col. 5, lines 52-57);

using the domain to locate information related to the video at a source other than the

video (submit search request for program information to Internet which is different

source of the current program – see figures 3 and 6);

extracting a datum (list of hits) related to a semantic event from the information (After the search has been performed, typically using the Internet, a list of at least one hit returned from the on line search is displayed- see col. 1, lines 52-55 and figure 4); extracting content related to the semantic event from the video related to the datum (select a hit on the list to display text such as a program review associated with it, see col. 1, lines 55-57 and figure 5).

Regarding claim 2, Dodson teaches the information is a textual summary of events (see col. 6, lines 48-56 and figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 3, Dodson teaches the information is included in a worldwide web site (see col. 5, lines 2-8).

Regarding claim 4, Dodson teaches the information is included in an electronic program guide (see col. 6, lines 15-20).

Regarding claim 6, Dodson teaches selection of the datum by a user of the summary (see col. 6, lines 53-56 and figure 6).

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schein et al. (US 6,002,394).

Regarding claim 11, Schein teaches a method comprising:

identifying a domain of a video (figure 16A);
using the domain to locate a textual summary of the video (figure 17B);
extracting a datum related to a semantic event relevant to the video summary from the textual summary (see figure 17B);
locating content in the video corresponding to the datum; and extracting the content related to the semantic event corresponding to the datum from the video for inclusion in the summary (see figures 16A – 20C).

4. Claims 7-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyer et al. (US 6,268,849).

Regarding claim 7, Boyer teaches a method comprising:
locating an index of a video from a source external to the video (Internet);
identifying a domain of the video abstraction;
using the domain to identify in the index video for inclusion in the abstraction; and
extracting the identified video (user select on icon on the program guide request for program and the selected program is displayed on the screen—see figures 8-10).

Regarding claim 8, Boyer teaches the index is included in a worldwide web site
(the program guide is received from Internet- see col. 2, lines 24-65);

Regarding claim 9, Boyer teaches the index is included in an electronic program guide
(see figure 9);

Regarding claim 10, Boyer teaches identifying of the domain by a user of the abstraction (user selects in icon on program guide- see col. 2, lines 49-65).

Regarding claim 12, Boyer teaches a method comprising:

locating an index of video in program guide received from Internet;

identification of a domain of the video abstraction by a user of the abstraction;

using the domain to select in the index video for inclusion in the abstraction; and

extracting the identified video (user selects a program from program guide to display the selected program- see figures 8-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (EP 0,848,554) as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Mugura et al. (US 6,111,614).

Regarding claim 5, Dodson teaches a method as discussed in the rejection of

Art Unit: 2611

claim 1. However, Dodson does not clearly disclose the domain is identified from an electronic program guide.

Mugura teaches the domain is identified from an electronic program guide (see figure 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dodson to incorporate the feature as taught by Mugura in order to allow user identifies the domain easily.


Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-1889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Son P. Huynh
April 18, 2003


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600